DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 359 205 TM 019 831

AUTHOR Shanks, Joyce
TITLE Unintended Outcomes: Curriculum and Outcome-Based Education.
PUB DATE Apr 93
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Atlanta, GA, April 12-16, 1993).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; *Curriculum Development; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Outcomes of Education; Political Influences; School Districts; Teacher Role; *Thinking Skills
IDENTIFIERS *Outcome Based Education

ABSTRACT

Outcome based education (OBE) is a way to organize curriculum and instruction so that the focus is on what educators want students to achieve. Key principles are defining clear outcomes, expanding learning opportunities to better achieve these outcomes, and having high expectations for learning success. OBE must be viewed as a process, rather than a predetermined program. Most current OBE applications are traditional OBE, in which the starting transitional OBE, where higher order competencies are defined, but curriculum is not completely redesigned. In a third level, transformational OBE, curriculum development begins after the outcomes are defined in terms of what a person should do or know. Uses of OBE in various school districts are described. OBE is gaining acceptance at a time when school reform is a national priority. The OBE mission focuses on what students are able to do. Some limitations of OBE, and some of the political influences that characterize knowledge production are reviewed. Successful OBE depends on a careful examination of the politics of curriculum development and the role teachers will assume. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED359205

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joyce Shanks

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

UNINTENDED OUTCOMES: CURRICULUM AND OUTCOME-BASED EDUCATION

by Joyce Shanks
University of Wisconsin-La Crosse

a paper presented at the American Educational Research Association
National Conference, Atlanta, April 14, 1992

TM019831

Unintended Outcomes: Curriculum and Outcome Based Education

by Joyce Shanks
University of Wisconsin-La Crosse

A paper presented at the American Educational Research Association
National Conference, Atlanta, April 14, 1992

Outcome-Based Education has become the new hope of many educators to be a guiding force for state and district educational reform. It responds to many of the commonly raised criticisms of schools. It promises change by focusing on outcomes. It can guarantee accountability by demanding mastery before students move to other challenges. It promises curriculum renewal by redefining curriculum goals on results rather than generalized goals. OBE's design suggests therapeutic change for districts reeling from curriculum stagnation. This is happening during a time when outside pressures augment the push for accountability. The match seems perfect.

Early indications show that OBE is living up to its goals and promises to become more and more popular. Since it is gaining in popularity, this makes it an important time to look more carefully at how OBE is defined and implemented in school districts. The goal of this paper is to discuss OBE and its possibilities by examining the objectives of its designers and examining its use in various districts. The paper will continue by critiquing OBE to examine possible strengths and limitations of its use. The paper will argue that without careful design and implementation, OBE could well become another in the long list of reforms that is eventually rejected by educators in schools and could, at the same time, undermine some of the very goals it hopes to support. The role of teachers in the implementation of OBE and the resulting effects on the curriculum will be considered.

A Description of OBE

Proponents describe OBE as a way to organize curriculum and instruction so that the focus is on what the educators want the students to achieve. Educators define the outcomes then plan the curriculum based on those outcomes. Three key principles become defining clear outcomes, expanding learning opportunities so as to better achieve those outcomes, and having high expectations for learning success (Spady, 1988). The constant reinforcement made in the literature is that all students can succeed, but at varying rates. Proponents say that success breeds success and that teachers control the conditions for students' success. The emphasis is on what students can do and achieve over time, not on what students can do on a particular test day with evaluation based on that performance before moving on to the next topic. The curriculum is then planned down from exit outcomes defining what it is that students are to achieve, to course outcomes, and down to unit and lesson outcomes. This does not mean that the outcomes are simply the objectives that educators have used in the past. Those who discuss how to implement OBE emphasize that the outcomes should be determined first, with the curriculum and accompanying texts then being planned based on the outcomes. They emphasize that this is much different than writing objectives based on the curriculum and textbooks that already exist in a district. The emphasis is placed on mastery of outcomes versus simply covering the curriculum. Therefore, students move at individual paces and the curriculum is augmented to meet varying needs of students until students master particular topics and are then able to move on. Traditional time-based requirements have to be redefined. Units cannot fit into neatly predetermined time slots since students all learn at different paces.

OBE cannot be a predetermined program, but instead must be viewed as a process. William Spady, one of the key supporters of OBE, describes it as "a way of designing, developing, delivering and documenting instruction in terms

of its intended goals and outcomes" (Spady, 1988:5). The use of the term outcome becomes important. Outcomes should not emphasize simply test scores or low levels of comprehension. They should be "culminating demonstrations of learning" (Brandt, 1992-93:66). Students should be asked to demonstrate the outcomes and show that they have a thorough knowledge of the concept. There should be points during the learning process where students can show what they are learning, called enabling outcomes, but they should lead to final demonstrations of students' abilities.

OBE itself can be viewed as an evolving process, since it has grown in what it has emphasized for students throughout its years of development. Spady and Marshall (1991) view it as taking three forms. The earliest form is Traditional OBE which most current applications of OBE usually resemble. The starting points of these forms is the districts' curriculum, which does not make it OBE in its purest form, if it were the outcomes would have determined the curriculum. The outcomes most resemble curriculum-based objectives, rather than predefined outcomes. The weaknesses of this includes the fact that small parts of the curriculum are usually designated as part of the outcome-based program and that curriculum does not come under close scrutiny to be defined, designed, and developed to fit the outcomes and goals of the community. Schooling practices are not radically challenged or changed, though Spady and Marshall still claim it is an effective means of improving student achievement.

A second step for OBE is Transitional OBE. At this level, higher order competencies are defined so that districts have these goals clearly in mind when planning, yet they can put off a complete redesign of their curriculum while implementing the OBE process. Integrating various areas of the curriculum can start to be done because the curriculum goals look at dispositions for students to assume rather than at subject specific knowledge. This is an important step for this begins the transition to the third level, and highest form of OBE.

This third level of OBE is Transformational OBE. This level of OBE paints a portrait of what a whole individual should be or could be and then asks the question as to what skills and knowledge that person would need for a successful life. With this portrait in mind, the curriculum development process can begin. The curriculum would be designed down from the high goals of a life-long and successful learner to what curriculum can be designed to lead to that success. All curriculum and school procedures become negotiable for change. Therefore, administrative decisions and traditional subject and time divisions become redefined around the demands of the newly developed exit outcomes. Curriculum, instructional delivery, student assessment, and student placement are all redesigned around the new outcomes demands, not on traditional practices.

The Uses of OBE

As OBE is becoming more popular across the country, there are more and more examples of its use starting to appear in the literature. This paper cannot do justice to the institution of OBE in various school districts and recommends various sources for more specific descriptions (Abrams, 1985; Burns, 1987; Erickson, et al., 1990; Evans and King, 1992; King and Bosma, 1991; Redding, 1991; Rogers et al., 1992; Spady and Marshall, 1991). Instead, some common uses will be discussed. This is done to provide a background to possible strengths and limitations of its use.

Spady and Marshall (1991) are the first to admit that most current applications of OBE lie in the traditional OBE format. This means that the curriculum is not undergoing any radical change. The starting point for curriculum modification is the existing curriculum. Burns and Squires (1987) say that while most districts have policy documents including philosophy statements and a scope and sequence of materials, they do not have curriculum

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

materials planned out. Therefore, teachers use what is already available to them. This means that they depend on the textbooks most of the time. Exit outcomes are then based on existing curriculum standards. This certainly does not match the goals of Transformational Outcome-Based Education. Yet at the same time it is a start to try to get school districts to move beyond traditional definitions of curriculum development to make the process more student centered.

Johnson City, NY is a district at the Transitional OBE level. (Spady and Marshall, 1991) They have been working toward mastery learning and outcome-based education since 1971. They have built their program around an Outcomes Driven Developmental Model (ODDM). The comprehensive program is built on a twenty-component program which states policies and procedures for the district and classroom. The district planned outcomes in five areas for all of its students: self-esteem, cognitive levels, process skills, self-directed learning and concern for others (Burns, 1987). The students must demonstrate eleven competencies for graduation. The New York State Curriculum outlines the starting point for the district's curriculum. Beyond that, the curriculum is based on the standard textbooks. The curriculum is reorganized into learning units with model lesson guides based on mastery learning principles. The teachers use teaming approaches for more variety of teachers' use of time and in the organization of children. The evaluation of students is based on a mastery, non-mastery grading system.

What makes this district unique is the overall philosophy which emphasizes that all students will learn and that the students will be given multiple opportunities to learn. The curriculum organization is not much different from traditional systems. Therefore, the OBE model is in the process of developing, though real curriculum reform is not yet evident. The district has been rewarded by continued improvement in their standardized test scores.

Red Bank, NJ is another district implementing OBE. The program began as a mastery learning model in 1979. The curriculum is based on unit objectives developed in each subject area and each grade level. These objectives become the focus of instruction with textbooks and other instructional material supporting the unit objectives. The units are reviewed and reworked by teachers in five-year cycles. The district has seen a steady improvement in test scores. The Metropolitan Achievement Test Scores of eighth graders in that district show a two to four year growth across subject areas from 1979 to 1984 (Abrams, 1985).

Spady and Marshall (1991) define the Aurora, Colorado Public Schools as being at the Transformational OBE level. The district has defined five learner outcomes that show the progressive orientation to focus on high level student behaviors. The five outcomes for students are being: self-directed learners, collaborative workers, complex thinkers, quality producers, and community contributors (Aurora Public Schools, 1992). Within these five outcomes are nineteen characteristics which students should demonstrate. The district has a four-step rubric to measure the level of performance students have for each of these characteristics (Redding, 1991). The rubric measures students at two novice levels, a competent level (which is the target goal), and an exceptional level. The curriculum is undergoing constant development to fuse subject area content with the Five Outcomes and assessment tasks which can evaluate student performance (Redding, 1991). The Aurora District took the time to plan their outcomes and design down from there, rather than starting with the traditional curriculum. They incorporated administrators and teachers at all levels to help insure the most involvement, participation, and agreement of outcomes and curriculum.

Minnesota is one of many states which has been working to implement its own OBE goals for several years. The Office of Educational Leadership was directed to plan a project to study the effectiveness of an OBE process to

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

improve the quality of what students learn (King and Bosma, 1991). Ten project sites in seventeen districts were chosen to receive grants to work on OBE implementation and other goals working to improve education in Minnesota leading into the twenty-first century. During the implementation several changes were noted. Categories of change were a reorganization and restructure including changing school schedules, increased student involvement, multi-level teaching, and more individualized lesson planning; change in terms of curriculum modification so that the focus was on developing learning outcomes and planning curriculum to meet those goals; and change in staff development activities (King, Bosma, and Binko, 1992). Effects on student learning is showing positive results. Students say they are learning more, with increased involvement, and with varied effects of OBE on the large variety of children (King, Bosma, and Binko, 1992). Overall positive comments have been heard from teachers, students, and parents, though difficulties with the process will be mentioned later.

The Popularity of OBE

Considering the increasing use of OBE in many states and districts, it is important to consider why OBE is becoming more and more popular. That discussion must then be tied into an analysis of how OBE is actually working in a variety of districts to see if it can meet the goals designed for its use.

Of course society always wishes to see improved schools. The 1980s saw a refocused attempt to concentrate on the quality of schools, the quality of the curriculum presented to students, and the quality of teachers, especially after the *A Nation At Risk* report, and other reports, focused national attention on schools. The accountability movement questions what students are learning and how well they are learning it. Government, business, parents, and other constituents have honest questions and recommendations to make as to how to improve school quality.

Therefore, Outcome-Based Education is coming into importance at a crucial time. It is another in the line of reforms attempting to answer questions about school quality. It has some different messages to give and some promising goals which can appeal to all levels of societal concern. It promises to redefine and redevelop curriculum around predetermined learning outcomes rather than traditional definitions of curriculum planning. It promises more authentic assessment of students, making sure that students actually know and understand concepts, rather than simply passing tests to attempt to measure learning. It promises to focus on outcomes, what skills students can do and perform, rather than on paper and pencil tasks that one hopes can be transferred and applied to real life situations.

The OBE mission focuses on the positives of what students are able to do. It states that all students can learn, that all students are always given the opportunity to learn, and that the curriculum is designed down from the goals to help insure that all students will learn. Grading is based on what students are able to do with high learner expectations, not on one final test of learning (Spady, 1992). The Outcomes-Driven Developmental Model (ODDM) of Johnson City, New York promises an "empowering, participatory, and non-coersive" model (Alessi, Rowe, & Mamary, 1991: 1).

All of these goals provide powerful tools for schools to use to defend their positions to taxpayers, government, business, and parents. Indeed, OBE outcomes match up well with recent business suggestions as to what makes a good worker. The (Labor) Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills (SCANS) reported what demands the workplace would like to make on graduates. After researching the needs of businesses, unions, factories, and workers, they reported that they would need students with the ability to put knowledge to practical use. The report asked for five competencies which could be demonstrated by all students. The competencies are the ability to identify,

organize, plan and allocate resources; the ability to use interpersonal communication skills including participating as a team member, teaching others skills, serving clients, exercising leadership, negotiating, and working with diversity; the ability to acquire, organize, interpret, and use information; the ability to understand, monitor, and improve design systems; and the ability to use, select, apply, and maintain technology (Scans, 1991).

These goals suggested by the Labor Department match well with the overall philosophy of OBE. They ask for students to show their skills and abilities in observable, measurable, applicable forms. Curriculum is to be planned to insure this happens. The fit between business' call to actions and the product that students produce in OBE is a good fit. Therefore, schools districts can feel that they are not only serving their demands to produce knowledgeable students, but meeting the demands of society for an able-bodied work force.

Unintended Outcomes: Limitations of OBE

With such high goals and promises of student success, the next step is to question how OBE might actually meet its goals and standards and what might act as obstructions to the process. OBE is slowly progressing from its roots in mastery learning into a concept which stresses more active roles for students, demanding students move to higher order thinking skills while also demonstrating that they actually understand the concepts. Yet in actuality, most districts' implementation of OBE is still what Spady calls the Traditional model of OBE (Spady & Marshall, 1991). Districts are planning their outcomes but building on the traditional curriculums that are in place. The curriculum tends to be the textbook curriculum. Robert Burns (1987) in his examination of districts moving toward an OBE implementation shows most of the districts either depending on their textbook curriculum as the foundation and bulk of the curriculum or dividing their curriculum into units designed around mastery learning and then using their texts and packages as the source for the implementation of their objectives.

Therefore, this usage is similar to the idea of teaching to the tests. When tests are in place, if teachers teach to the tests they can be assured of higher student success rates on the tests. The same is true when planning outcomes to fit existing curriculum documents. The curriculum documents and mechanisms are already in place so the outcomes can be worded to fit what is there. This does not mean that the outcomes planned are exactly what the teachers, administrators, and community members would like to see their students doing. Nor is it insuring that students are going to be taught the higher order skills with the demonstration of those skills as is the hallmark of OBE. Instead of designing the curriculum to fit the desired outcomes, the outcomes are designed to fit the curriculum.

Many districts are using OBE much in the same way that they implemented mastery learning. Twenty years ago the concept of Outcome-Based Education was synonymous with mastery learning. Both emphasized that students can learn and that students should learn material well before moving on to new material. Since then the OBE philosophy has grown from its roots to stress a more diverse definition of mastery. The outcomes are to designed to stress higher order thinking skills. The curriculum is to be planned around the outcomes. Yet in actual use, OBE is still more similar to what mastery learning goals are than to what OBE is now theorized to be. The programs are curricular and mastery-based, versus outcome-based. There may not even be a clear picture of what learning outcomes are. One must consider the design limitations of current OBE practices and other perceived weaknesses of mastery learning. These weaknesses include the fact that tests used may be designed to gain high achievement in control groups on which overall success is measured and that testing procedures may hold teachers more narrowly to a particular curriculum in order to master particular objectives than what teachers may otherwise feel

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

is important to do (Slavin, 1990). OBE needs to grow beyond the mastery learning roots before it is ever successful in reaching its goals.

A second limitation to the use of OBE is in some teachers' attitudes toward it as a curriculum reform package. Researchers who have studied OBE in practice have discussed teachers' often negative reactions to OBE. James Towers (1992) discusses some of the potential problems of OBE including the fact that many educators have a poor understanding of it and that teachers may resist its use for a number of reasons. Teachers may resist the time commitment, the suggestion that all students will learn if taught well, and have negative feelings about the use of mastery learning and its value as a teaching device. Teachers may also change curriculum plans of the district and use them as they would like in their classrooms.

Teachers were found to have similar questions in Minnesota (King & Bosma, 1991). Some teachers did not feel comfortable with the OBE process and felt they did not have the understanding or knowledge base to make the program effective. Complaining of short inservices, they felt they did not have the time needed to prepare to institute OBE. Other teachers did not value it as a goal and were hesitant to institute it over other programs. They questioned the need for OBE and whether good teachers needed it. The idea of OBE being forced down on them from the state also made other teachers feel negatively toward OBE. That led to an argument over how it was implemented rather than necessarily questioning the validity of OBE (King & Bosma, 1991).

A third limitation of how OBE is implemented is closely related to teachers' reactions of the process. The concern is the time that OBE implementation will take. The process involves a complete change in how curriculum is defined and designed. This will take a long time to do through the inservice process. This must be done before the new curriculum can be implemented. This will make the process of successfully instituting OBE difficult. Teachers need to be given the time to be comfortable with the change process if they are to be an active part of the process. While Wayne Erickson (1990) raises this as a concern, he also emphasized the fact that implementation must be fast enough to meet the needs of those working to reform districts' curriculum to sell their programs to educators and the public. The balance may be difficult to achieve.

For Outcome-Based Education to build beyond its mastery learning roots and work to obtain its goals as defined in Transformational OBE, the difficulties of truly redefining and redeveloping the curriculum, teachers' attitudes toward the process, and the demands of time will need to be seriously considered. Unfortunately, when OBE is described it is viewed as a process to be done in schools without necessarily considering the politics of knowledge formation or the nature of the work of teachers. Both of these also need to be considered in more detail.

The Politics of Knowledge Production

While researchers have described the traditional forms that OBE has taken in schools and the need to redefine and redesign curriculum, for the most part the end result has still been a very traditional use of curriculum. The objectives are basically synonymous with the outcomes. Activities are planned to help students to achieve these goals. The knowledge presented emphasizes what Dwayne Huebner (1975) calls the technical and scientific concerns. The technical "seeks to maximize change in students" and the scientific "seeks to maximize the attainment of information or knowledge for the teacher" (Huebner, 1975: 225). These are important dimensions in curriculum formation but should not occur without a thorough consideration of the other value dimensions to curriculum formation which Huebner describes including the political, ethical, and esthetic (Huebner, 1975).

When planning a new curriculum or individual lessons educators must value the political process involved in knowledge production: what knowledge

is to be taught, whose knowledge will be taught, what form will it take? These questions are crucial and have not been evident in the OBE literature. Yes, educators must consider the portrait of an educated person to guide the development of outcomes. Yet this can not happen in an apolitical environment. Educators must also consider what the portrait would be of an educated person ready to function as part of a democracy with the skills needed to function in a democracy.

> A democratic theory of education recognizes the importance of empowering citizens to make educational policy and also of constraining their choices among policies in accordance with those principles - of nonrepression and nondiscrimination - that preserve the intellectual and social foundations of democratic deliberations. A society that empowers citizens to make educational policy, moderated by these two principled constraints, realizes the democratic idea of education. (Gutmann, 1987: 14)

This view of education calls for success for all students. It assumes high standards for all. It requires critical thinking to emancipate students' thoughts and lead to action. But critical thinking, even in applicable exit outcomes, is not enough.

> By failing to place "critical thinking" within an overtly democratic context, conservative and libertarian educators have been able to neutralize the potential effectiveness of this notion for generating substantive reforms in our schools. As a result, the numerous critical thinking strategies being offered today actually inhibit the development of schooling for critical democracy by turning our attention in the wrong direction. We do not need young people who are simply capable of developing their powers of rationality so that they can obtain the greatest power possible when they enter our market economy. What is needed are young people who have learned to use their minds critically in order to recognize those powers that inhibit and those that work towards the creation of a more compassionate, caring, and socially just world, as well as the moral courage to participate with those in the latter group. (Goodman, 1992: 159)

We must recognize that schools have not always served all of its students equally. Therefore, this view of education must also acknowledge minority and working class students who have not done as well as their white middle class counterparts. It must give voice to all students and work to engage the knowledge and experiences of all children so as to involve them and empower them to find success in school, and pave the path toward active involvement as adults.

The political dimension of knowledge production can build close connections with the ethical and esthetic value frameworks that Huebner touches on so as to plan an educational experience that can be of value to the "whole" child. The process must have a value beyond just knowledge production. It must work toward the artistry, the connoisseurship (Eisner, 1985), the knowledgeable perception, that helps students to not only understand but to appreciate the educational process.

OBE has noble goals in asserting that all students can learn and in trying to have students move toward actively demonstrating what they know. Yet a true commitment toward a quality educational system must do more than this. It must make sure it is looking beyond the technical and scientific value systems when planning and implementing curriculum. There must be a commitment toward quality and a commitment toward equality, focusing on the

political, esthetic, and ethical dimensions of curriculum. Therefore, these must be overt goals from the very first planning stages. Views of an educated child cannot consider the child in isolation or only consider the child in the future work world. The planning stages must consider the role of schools in developing a democratic society and realize educators' potential power as democratic curriculum planners. If all of these aspects are not there, then the educational process will continue to benefit certain students while disempowering and disenfranchising other students. It will continue to see the success of certain groups of students in schools at the expense of other students in schools whether the district follows Outcome Based Education or not.

The Nature of Teachers' Work

Developing and implementing OBE in a district demands the efforts of all school personnel including teachers. Teachers will obviously have a large responsibility placed on them to plan the exit outcomes and to plan the curriculum changes to fit the outcomes. Some of the potential limitations of this have been discussed. Since not all teachers agree with the OBE philosophy, they may not be willing to do the work demanded to make real change. They may also not appreciate the top-down nature of the initiation of the OBE process. The time pressures on teachers will also be an important consideration. Though these points have all been raised in the literature, little has been said about addressing these issues when implementing OBE other that saying that districts will need long periods of time to complete an OBE project successfully and that teachers will need release time to do the work.

A more thorough examination of teachers' work must occur to realize fully the limitations on teachers' abilities to be actively involved and full participants in the OBE process. Ann Bastian, et al., (1986) discussed the current pressures on teachers in schools.

> Highly bureaucratic administrative structures often strip teachers of the opportunity to shape their work creatively. Excessive standardization along with large classes, supervisory duties, excessive paperwork, and fragmented work periods reduce teachers to caretakes and technicians. Limited in service training, inadequate continuing education, low pay, and low status contribute to teachers' sense of isolation and demoralization. Teachers themselves, in responding to these pressures, may also mistrust innovation, compound the rigidities of the system, and assume adversarial positions toward community demands. At times, this siege mentality has overcome teacher associations as well. Hence, we often encounter what seems a deadlocked contradiction between oppressive authority and passive resistance. (Bastian, et al., 1986: 107)

This process is known as the deskilling of teachers' labor. In many schools teachers have become managers of the learning process. Curriculum is planned and teachers manage the pace through which students progress. The professional responsibilities of curriculum planning is done for them by textbook publishers and authors of other curriculum packages which districts use to make up the bulk of their curriculum. This is often accompanied by the intensification of their labor (Apple, 1986; Shanks, 1990). Though some of the professional responsibilities have been taken from teachers and given to others, this does not mean that teachers' work is simplified in terms of demands on their time. In fact, the opposite is often true. The curriculum packages, testing programs, and accountability mechanisms in place in schools leave teachers with a plethora of paperwork. Teachers have an inordinate number of meetings to occupy their little free work time.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This can have a very negative effect on the spirit and work of teachers. When teachers, or any workers, have such a large amount of work to do it can impede their ability to take on new responsibilities, even jobs which they are interested in and eager to do well. "One of the most significant impacts of intensification may be in reducing the quality, not the quantity, of service provided to people" (Apple, 1986: 42).

This will have an influence on the ability of teachers to be actively involved in the implementation of OBE. Therefore, their current work roles must be reconsidered when ready to begin such massive educational reorganization. If teachers are to be enthusiastic and active participants in the process, then they will need to be allowed the time and freedom to become active and have their work respected as active participants in the professional planning and institution throughout the entire OBE process. Henry Giroux describes a possibility of the type of role which teachers should have in his description of teachers as transformative intellectuals (Giroux, 1988). The assumption of teachers as intellectuals is first of all giving a professional definition to the work teachers do, valuing their work as true intellectual labor. It also assumes the power to function as professionals who are in control of their labor, rather than enduring forms of technical control where they are managers of students' learning processes and not in control of their own curricular decisions. It assumes that teachers can work in "producing and legitimating" (Giroux, 1988: 125) knowledge production, pedagogical strategies, and the political dimensions of the curriculum development process.

Until we see teachers assuming this type of a role, OBE or other curricular/educational reforms will have little possibility for success. Teachers need to be active participants. And to be truly active participants they must have the ability to redefine and redevelop ideas to accommodate their students and to provide students with the variety of experiences needed to reach the diverse needs and personalities in each class. This also assumes a level of power for teachers. This will not make it possible to have a process such as Outcome-Based Education come as a top-down mandate where teachers, as a group, are to be involved in the implementation of the process without full participation for the acceptance or rejection of the reform. To deny teachers this right it to deny them the power to be active participants and full curriculum partners who can best work to develop the democratic curriculum reform which must occur to be of benefit for all students. Any less power will work to make teachers managers of the curriculum change and decrease the possibility of successful reform.

Therefore, the role and work of teachers must be acknowledged as more than the idea that teachers will need additional inservice time. Their entire professional responsibility and work role will need to be considered from the start of any OBE process.

OBE As an Educational Reform Movement

Outcome-Based Education is enjoying increasing popularity. Many states have endorsed OBE and more and more districts are using its principles for guidance as a curriculum renewal project. If it is to meet the long-term goals which so many educators have for it then it will have to keep in mind several important elements for successful reform. Many reforms keep reappearing again and again but make little real change in schools (Cuban, 1990). Larry Cuban discusses the risks of not actively involving teachers, not having solutions that accurately match school problems, poor planning of finances, and lack of faith in reforms plans (Cuban, 1990). These must all be considerations when designing OBE.

Outcome-Based Education is built on the ideology that all students can learn and that the process of learning should be based on what outcomes districts want of students. It has been argued here that curriculum and the

role of teachers must be examined much more seriously in the development of an OBE process in any school district. Without a careful examination of the politics of curriculum development, then the curriculum change will not likely be successful for all students in our schools. And without an examination of the role teachers will assume and their power in this role, then the chance of success for the OBE process will also be weakened. These two points need to be much more seriously considered in the OBE literature. Without this, then OBE may well be another of the reforms which seem to return and appear in cycles but leave little impact on schools.

References

Abrams, J.D. (1985). Making outcome-based education work. *Educational Leadership, 43* (1), 30-32.

Alessi, F.V., Rowe, L., & Mamary, A. (1991). *The Outcomes-Driven Developmental Model: A program for comprehensive school improvement.* Johnson City, NY: Johnson City School District.

Apple, M.W. (1986). *Teachers and texts: A political economy of class & gender relations in education.* New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Aurora Public Schools. (1992). *Pursuing our commitment to life long learning: Strategic planning process, third edition.*

Bastian, A., Fruchter, N., Gittell, M., Greer, C., & Haskins, K. (1985). *Choosing equality: The case for democratic schooling.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Brandt, R. (1992, December - 1993, January). On Outcome-Based Education: A conversation with Bill Spady. *Educational Leadership, 50* (4), 66-70.

Burns, R. (1987). *Models of instructional organization: A casebook on mastery learning and Outcome-Based Education.* San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Burns, R., & Squires, D. (1987, October). *Curriculum organization in Outcome-Based Education.* San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Cuban, L. (1990, January-February). Reforming again, again, and again. *Education Researcher, 19* (1), 3-13.

Eisner, E. W. (1985). *The educational imagination: On the design and evaluation of school programs* (2nd ed.). New York: Collier Macmillan.

Erickson, W., et al. (1990, February). *Outcome-Based Education: A Minnesota vision.* St. Paul: Minnesota State Department of Education.

Evans, K.M. & King, J.A. (1992, April). *The outcomes of outcome-based education: Research and implications.* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Giroux, H. (1988). *Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning.* Granby, MA: Bergin & Garvey Publishers.

Goodman, J. (1992). *Elementary schooling for critical democracy.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Gutmann, A. (1987). *Democratic education.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Huebner, D. (1975). Curricular language and classroom meanings. In W. Pinar (Ed.), *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists* (pp. 217-236). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

King, J.A. & Bosma, J. (1991, April). *After one year: Implementation issues for ten transformational R&D sites.* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

King, J.A., Bosma, J., & Binko, J. (1992, April). *After two years: A study of educational transformation in ten Minnesota sites.* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Redding, N. (1991, May). Assessing the big outcomes. *Educational Leadership, 48* (8), 49-53.

Rogers, S., et al. (1992). Outcome-Based Education operationalized in the classroom: The Glendale Outcome-Based Instructional model. In I.L. Gray & G.M. Hymel (Eds.), *Successful schooling for all: A primer on Outcome-Based Education and mastery learning.* Roseville, MN: Network for Outcome-Based Schools.

Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills. (1991). *What work requires of schools: A SCANS report for America 2000.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor.

Shanks, J. (1990, April). *Some effects of curriculum standardization on elementary teachers and students.* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Slavin, R.E. (1990, Summer). Mastery learning re-reconsidered. *Review of Educational Research, 60* (2), 300-302.

Spady, W.G. (1988). Organizing for results: The basis of authentic restructuring and reform. *Educational Leadership, 46* (2), 4-8.

Spady, W.G. (1992). Key messages from the high success program on OBE: Part I. In I.L. Gray & G.M. Hymel (Eds.), *Successful schooling for all: A primer on Outcome Based Education and mastery learning.* Roseville, MN: Network for Outcome Based Schools.

Spady, W.G. & Marshall, K.J. (1991, October). Beyond traditional Outcome-Based Education. *Educational Leadership, 49* (2), 67-72.

Towers, J.M. (1992, Spring). Outcome-based education: Another educational bandwagon? *The Educational Forum, 56* (3), 291-305.